1	ANDRÉ BIROTTE JR. United States Attorney	
2	United States Attorney LEON W. WEIDMAN	
3	Assistant United States Attorney Chief, Civil Division	
4	JASON K. AXE	
5	Assistant United States Attorney California Bar Number 187101 Federal Building, Suite 7516	
	300 North Los Angeles Street	
6	Los Angeles, California 90012 Telephone: (213) 894-8827	
7	Telephone: (213) 894-8827 Facsimile: (213) 894-7819 E-mail: Jason.Axe@usdoj.gov	
8	Attorneys for Defendant	
9	JONATHAN H. BLAVIN (State Bar No.	230269)
10	jonathan.blavin@mto.com LAURA K. LIN (State Bar No. 281542)	
11	laura.lin@mto.com   MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP	
12	560 Mission Street Twenty-Seventh Floor San Francisco, California 94105-2907	
13	San Francisco, California 94105-2907   Telephone: (415) 512-4000	
14	Telephone: (415) 512-4000 Facsimile: (415) 512-4077	
15	Attorneys for Plaintiff American Management Services LLC, d/b/a Pinnacle	
16		
17	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
18	FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
19	WESTERN DIVISION	
20		
21	MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP	No. CV 13-06890 DDP (MANx)
22	O/B/O AMERICAN MANAGEMENT SERVICES LLC, D/B/A/ PINNACLE,	JOINT REPORT OF
23	Plaintiff,	CONFERENCE OF PARTIES
24	v.	[Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(f)]
25	UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF	Date: April 21, 2014 Time: 3:30 p.m.
26	THE ARMY,	Ctrm: Hon. Dean D. Pregerson
	Defendants.	
27		
28		

On March 27, 2014, pursuant to Rule 26(f) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Plaintiff and Defendant, through their undersigned counsel, held their Conference of Parties.

The parties hereby submit their Joint Report of Conference of Parties pursuant to Rule 26(f) and the Court's Order filed March 5, 2014.

This is an action brought pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act. Plaintiff's complaint was filed on September 18, 2013. Defendant answered Plaintiff's complaint on February 5, 2014.

During the Conference of Parties, the parties conferred to consider the nature and basis of their claims and defenses and the possibilities for a prompt settlement or resolution of the case.

#### I. <u>DISCOVERY PLAN - REQUIRED BY FED. R. CIV. P. 26(f)</u>

### A. Rule 26(a) Disclosures (Rule 26(f)(3)(A))

The parties propose that the disclosures required by Rule 26(a)(1) shall be due on or before **April 25, 2014**.

The parties do not propose that any changes be made in the timing, form or requirement for disclosures under Rule 26(a)(2).

The parties do not propose that any changes be made in the timing, form, or requirement for disclosures under Rule 26(a)(3).

# B. <u>Issues Regarding Discovery (Rule 26(f)(3)(B))</u>

# 1. Subjects on Which Discovery May Be Needed

If necessary, the parties shall conduct discovery concerning the claims raised by Plaintiff in the Complaint and the defenses raised by Defendant in the Answer.

## 2. When Discovery Should Be Completed

Because this is an action brought pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act, discovery should be stayed until Defendant has filed its motion for summary judgment. <u>Lane v. Dep't of Interior</u>, 523 F.3d 1128, 1134-35 (9th Cir. 2008).

-1-

### 3. <u>Limitations on Discovery</u>

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

In an action under the Freedom of Information Act, discovery is limited and should be stayed until Defendant has filed its motions for summary judgment. <u>See</u> Lane v. Dep't of Interior, 523 F.3d 1128, 1134 (9th Cir. 2008).

# C. <u>Issues Related To Disclosure Of Electronically Stored</u> Information (Rule 26(f)(3)(C))

The parties have agreed to produce hard copies of all relevant documents.

# D. <u>Issues Related To Claims Of Privilege Or Protection Of Trial-</u> <u>Preparation Material (Rule 26(f)(3)(D))</u>

The parties do not propose any special procedure regarding privilege or protection of trial-preparation material.

### E. Changes To Limitations On Discovery (Rule 26(f)(3)(E))

The parties do not request that the Court change the limitations on discovery imposed under these rules or by local rule, nor do the parties propose other limitations, however, the parties reserve the right to make such requests prior to the discovery cutoff date.

# F. Additional Orders (Rule 26(f)(3)(F))

# 1. Rule 26(c) Orders

The parties at this time do not anticipate seeking any orders pursuant to Rule 26(c) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, however, the parties reserve the right to pursue such orders as needed prior to the discovery cutoff date.

# 2. Rule 16(b) Orders (Rule 16(b)(3))

# (1) <u>Deadline to Join Parties and Amend Pleadings</u>

The parties propose **April 30, 2014** as the deadline to join other parties and to propose amendments to the pleadings.

# (2) <u>Deadline to Complete Discovery</u>

Discovery should be stayed until Defendant has filed its motion for summary judgment. <u>Lane v. Dep't of Interior</u>, 523 F.3d 1128, 1134-35 (9th Cir. 2008).

### (3) <u>Deadline to File Motions</u>

The parties agree that it is in their mutual interest to engage in motion practice without delay. Plaintiff first submitted its record request approximately eighteen months ago, on October 8, 2012. On September 18, 2013, Plaintiff filed a Complaint for Injunctive and Declaratory Relief Under the Freedom of Information Act, 5 U.S.C. § 552 (the "Complaint") alleging that Defendant failed to respond adequately to Plaintiff's Request. Defendant responded on February 5, 2014. The parties propose <u>June 23, 2014</u> as the deadline for Defendant to file any motions. Plaintiffs' motions, if any, will be filed on or before **August 5, 2014**.

# (4) Proposed Modifications of Times for Disclosure

The parties have not proposed changes to the times for disclosure under Rule 26.

### (5) <u>Proposed Modifications of Extent of Discovery</u>

The parties have not proposed modifications regarding the extent of discovery, other than Defendant's request for a stay of discovery pending Defendant's filing of its motion for summary judgment.

# (6) <u>Proposed Provisions for Disclosure of Electronically</u> Stored Information

The parties have agreed to produce hard copies of all relevant documents.

# (7) <u>Proposed Agreements for Asserting Claims of</u> Privilege of Trial-Preparation Material

The parties do not propose any special procedure regarding privilege or protection of trial-preparation material.

# (8) Proposed Date for Conferences Before Trial, Final Pretrial Conference, and Trial

The parties note that they do not expect a trial in this matter as cases brought pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act are typically resolved by motions for

summary judgment. Nonetheless, for purposes of this Rule 26(f) report, the parties propose **September 22, 2014** as the date for the Final Pretrial Conference. The parties propose **October 7, 2014** as the date for trial.

#### 3. Rule 16(c) Orders

### (1) Advisability of Referring Matters to Magistrate Judge

The parties respectfully do not consent to reference of this matter to the Magistrate Judge.

### (2) <u>Settlement Procedures</u>

The parties have agreed to submit to Settlement Procedure No. 1, before the Magistrate Judge assigned to the case, pursuant to Local Rule 16-15.4.

### (3) Form and Substance of Pretrial Order

The Pretrial Conference Order shall be completed in the manner and form contemplated by Local Rule 16-6.

### II. ADDITIONAL ISSUES - REQUIRED BY LOCAL RULE 26-1

# A. Complex Cases (Local Rule 26-1(a))

The parties agree that the Manual for Complex Litigation does not apply to this action.

# B. Motion Schedule (Local Rule 26-1(b))

As is customary in FOIA cases, the parties anticipate that this action will be resolved through motion practice. The parties propose **September 1, 2014** as the cutoff date by which all dispositive or partially dispositive motions shall be heard.

# **C. ADR** (**Local Rule 26-1**(c))

The parties have begun preliminary discussions concerning settlement of this action. Plaintiff has been advised of the necessity to present any settlement demands in writing. The parties have agreed to submit to Settlement Procedure No. 1, before the Magistrate Judge assigned to the case, pursuant to Local Rule 16-15.4.

### D. Trial Estimate (Local Rule 26-1(d))

The parties note that they do not expect a trial in this matter as cases brought pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act are typically resolved by motions for summary judgment. Nonetheless, for purposes of this Rule 26(f) report, the parties estimate that the trial of this matter shall take 1-2 days.

### E. Additional Parties (Local Rule 26-1(e))

It is not anticipated at this times that additional parties are likely to appear in this action.

### F. Expert Witnesses (Local Rule 26-1(f))

The parties do not propose any modification to the schedule for disclosures set forth in Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a)(2)(D).

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 14, 2014 MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP JONATHAN H. BLAVIN LAURA K. LIN

/s/ Jonathan H. Blavin JONATHAN H. BLAVIN Attorneys for Plaintiff Munger, Tolles & Olson LLP o/b/o American Management Services LLC d/b/a Pinnacle

Dated: April 14, 2014

ANDRÉ BIROTTE JR.
United States Attorney
LEON W. WEIDMAN
Assistant United States Attorney
Chief, Civil Division

JASON K. AXE
JASON K. AXE
Assistant United States Attorney
Attorneys for Defendant
United States of America

### ATTESTATION PURSUANT TO L.R. 5-4.3.4

Jason K. Axe, Assistant United States Attorney and Attorney for Defendant, on whose behalf this filing is submitted, concurs in this filing's content and has authorized the filing.

/s/ Jonathan H. Blavin JONATHAN H. BLAVIN